

Let me add the fact that we are supposed to set an example for the world. Is this really free speech? Is this really the example we want to set? Let one side air their viewpoint without allowing the other side time to air theirs? Are we really just a dictatorship in democratic clothing? Do we even have anyone in authority that cares? Let's see what example you set for the world:

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.